



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/388,826	09/01/1999	WEIMIN LI	MI22-1208	4483

7590

11/12/2002

WELLS ST. JOHN P.S.  
601 W. First Avenue  
Suite 1300  
Spokane, WA 99201-3828

EXAMINER

KIELIN, ERIK J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2813

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2002

31

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/388,826

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Erik Kielin

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 102-124, 126-131, 133 and 134 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 102-124, 126-131, 133 and 134 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 29.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The amendment filed 5 March 2002, Paper No. 21, is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure, specifically into the specification at pages 7, line 20 to page 8, line 15. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Applicant does not appear to have support for the added phrase "between the plates of" to describe the spacing.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Moreover, Examiner notes that Applicant indicated in Paper No. 25, filed 17 May 2002, in the paragraph bridging pages 2 to 3, that the new matter would be removed, stating "in the event that the Examiner feels that the public is better served by elision of this description, Applicants are willing to delete this explanatory text." Examiner feels that the public is better served by elision of the new matter. No removal of the new matter has yet been provided.

This objection was made previously in the Office action filed 4 June 2002.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 102-110, 112-124, 126-128 and 129-131, 133, 134 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over **Yau** et al. (US 6,072,227) in view of **Morita** (JP 63-157443

A).

**Yau** discloses the substrate 512 (Fig. 8A) having at least partially formed integrated circuitry formed thereon; depositing thereon a low k dielectric layer 510, 518, (which may be a liner layer, cap layer, intermetal dielectric layer, or etch stop layer; [Abstract]) using a PECVD method with precursors of, for example, methylsilane and an oxygen containing gas, such as O<sub>2</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>O (col. 5, lines 35-37). Note that the dielectric layer is porous (col. 3, lines 13-29) and has a dielectric constant of less than 3.0 (**Yau**, claim 13) and in one example, a dielectric constant of 2.5 (col. 15, lines 5-18). The layer has from 1% to 50 % carbon from Si-CH<sub>3</sub> bonds. (See also, col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 52.)

**Yau** does not teach plasma treating the dielectric layer with oxygen plasma.

**Morita** discloses a very similar method to **Yau** comprising forming a low-dielectric-constant material comprising phenyl or alkyl silicon oxide 10 which inherently has a dielectric constant of less than 3.5 over an integrated circuit Fig. 2; blanket exposing the dielectric to oxygen plasma to form and upper surface 11 of silicon oxide which is inherently effective to reduce the dielectric constant. (See Figs. 1-2; page 2, lower two column.) Note that a whole of the dielectric layer is not converted from one base to another (Applicant's claim 19) and that the (CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>x</sub>SiO<sub>y</sub> remains as (CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>x</sub>SiO<sub>y</sub>. Note that the plasma exposure time is 10 minutes. Regarding claim 14, **Morita** forms the organic silicon oxide layer using R<sub>n</sub>Si(OH)<sub>4-n</sub> wherein R is any alkyl group. Examiner repeats the unchallenged official notice that alkyl includes methyl as this is the simplest of the alkyl group members. (See Hackh's, *supra*.)

---

To quote from **Morita** at page 5,

“When this semiconductor substrate 1 is exposed to an **oxygen plasma** for ten minutes, the **organic functional groups** of **organic** silicon thin film 10 **are removed** to a desired depth, transforming into a silicon oxide film. As such, the film thickness of organic silicon thin film 10 as initially formed, in its thinnest portions, transforms **nearly** entirely to silicon oxide film 11; only in the thickest portion does it come so as to have a **two-layer structure of silicon oxide film 11 and organic film 10** (figure 3).”  
(Emphasis added; page 5 of translation, lines 5-14).

**Morita** teaches that the oxygen plasma treatment solves the problem of poor insulation of the upper portion of organic spin-on glasses by removing the excess organic moieties at the surface, while beneficially preserving adhesion to the underlying layers by leaving the organic moieties in the lower portion of the film. (See translation provided by Applicant, section entitled “FUNCTION” beginning on p. 3.)

Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify **Yau** to carry out the plasma treatment in **Morita** for the reasons just indicated in **Morita** for carrying out the plasma treatment. As indicated the dielectric would inherently be lowered because Applicant indicates that an oxygen plasma treatment will lower the dielectric constant. This makes common sense since the organic portion removed will leave behind additional porosity in the **Yau** dielectric layer, and space has the lowest dielectric constant attainable thereby lowering the overall dielectric constant of the layer.

Regarding claim 103, **Yau** discloses  $O_2$  and  $N_2O$  and any oxygen containing gas, as noted above.

Regarding claims 104, 105 as noted above, **Morita** teaches oxygen which is not water and is therefore, dry oxygen.

Regarding claim 106-108, **Yau** discloses nitrous oxide,  $N_2O$ .

Regarding claim 109, **Yau** discloses methyl silane and  $N_2O$  deposition, and **Yau** teaches oxygen plasma exposure.

Regarding claim 110, the stability of the dielectric layer is inherently increased for the reasons indicated in **Morita** and by Applicant.

Regarding claim 112, **Morita** teaches that the organic silicon film is cured at  $450^\circ\text{C}$  and no heating appears to be indicated; therefore, the temperature during exposure must be less than  $550^\circ\text{C}$ .

Regarding claim 113, the **Morita** exposure is not indicated to etch.

Regarding claims 114-115, 122, 123, and 130, both **Yau** and **Morita** make the film from at least methylsilane. **Yau** specifically indicates that the film has from 1-50% carbon arising from Si-C bonds, preferably 20%. (col. 5, lines 12-44). Furthermore, Applicant has not indicated any criticality to the claimed portions. See In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969) (Claimed elastomeric polyurethanes which fell within the broad scope of the references were held to be unpatentable thereover because, among other reasons, there was *no evidence of the criticality* of the claimed ranges of molecular weight or molar proportions.). Any difference is a matter of routine optimization within prior art general conditions. (See MPEP 2144.05.)

Regarding claim 116, **Morita**, as noted above indicates that the exposure the organo dielectric leaves the organo dielectric substantially as its original composition. Since **Yau** teaches Applicant's specific method of deposition using Applicant's claimed methylsilane, the deposited film is  $(\text{CH}_3)_x\text{SiO}_y$ , which would stay "substantially as  $(\text{CH}_3)_x\text{SiO}_y$ " according to the teachings in **Yau** and by Applicant.

Regarding claims 117-121, although the time is not exactly as claimed by Applicant, it has been held that claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art. See In re Huang, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688(Fed. Cir. 1996). In the instant case, there exists no evidence of record to indicate that some unexpected result arises from the claimed time range relative to that in the applied art. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use a shorter exposure time than in **Morita** since the dielectric layer formed by **Yau** is already porous and oxidized by the method of deposition rather than being a solid mass formed by a spin-on technique. The choice of exact time is an obvious matter of routine optimization to provide the best dielectric layer with the lowest reasonable dielectric constant.

Regarding claim 124 and 131, as noted above, the insulative layer may be an interlayer dielectric.

Regarding claims 126-128, 133, and 134, the **Yau** deposited dielectric layer is deposited with a dielectric constant of 2.5, as noted above. It is held absent evidence to the contrary that the dielectric constant is reduced by at least 10% or about 15% by exposure to the oxygen plasma and that the dielectric constant is inherently stabilized. If it is thought for some reason that the dielectric constant is not reduced or is not stabilized by exposure to the oxygen plasma, then these may be a difference. But, it has been held, where the Patent Office has reason to believe that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in the claimed subject matter may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to require the applicant to prove that subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the

characteristics relied on. (See MPEP 2112.) Given the similarity (if not equality) of the dielectric materials formed, the present evidence indicates that the dielectric constant must necessarily be reduced and stabilized.

4. Claim 111 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yau** in view of **Morita**, as applied to claims 102-110, 112-124, 126-128 above, and in further view of **Miyasaka** (US 6,017,779).

The prior art as explained above discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for (1) depositing the  $(\text{CH}_3)_x\text{SiO}_y$  layer and exposing in the same chamber is not taught (Applicant's claims 8 and 34); and (2) shutting off the silicon process gas and maintaining conditions in the chamber to expose the dielectric to the oxygen plasma is not taught (Applicant's claim 35).

**Miyasaka** teaches a method of forming a silicon oxide layer on a semiconductor device using plasma-enhanced CVD with silicon-containing compound and a oxygen-containing gas and then shutting off the silicon-containing precursor and then exposing to the oxygen plasma in the same chamber maintained at sub-atmospheric pressure. (See **Miyasaka**, column 44, "Example 6" especially lines 35-52.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify either of **Yau** in view of **Morita** to maintain a device in a single chamber as taught by **Miyasaka** in order to beneficially prevent contamination to the semiconductor device dielectric layer between process steps, as is well known in the art to do, and furthermore, because it would simplify the process dramatically by preventing a switch in chambers.



---

*Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3 September 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the restriction requirement, Examiner apologizes for any inconvenience provided Applicant for the confusion indicated by Examiner regarding the two claims drawn to the species of dielectric film comprising silicon bonded to both organic matter and nitrogen. It is pointed out that **these claims have not been canceled**, but instead have simply withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species. Moreover, the first restriction requirement, Paper No. 4, Mark Matkin elected the species (indicated at the time to be allowable, by a different examiner than the present examiner) which were **not** directed to the dielectric film comprising silicon bonded to both organic matter and nitrogen. The claims to which Examiner was referring that were canceled were those originally canceled in an Examiner's Amendment with the authorization of Mark Matkin. Examiner thanks Applicant's present Representative for the mostly thorough assessment of the restriction.

Applicant has argued at length (Paper No. 29, filed 12 September 2002 at pp. 17-18) that Examiner has pointed out locations in the **Yau** reference that are "garbled" and "misdescriptive." Further clarification has been requested. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears that Applicant is either referring to the incorrect passages in **Yau** or is referring to another reference, although ostensibly referring to the **Yau** US 6,072,227. Examiner has re-checked the passages provided and finds them consistent with information indicated in the rejection. Examiner kindly suggests that Applicant also re-check to ensure that he/she was looking at the **Yau** patent at the

passages indicated by Examiner. Accordingly, Examiner can clarify no further, because the passages referred to in **Yau** by Applicant are not those to which Examiner referred Applicant.

Applicant appears to argue that Examiner has indicated that **Yau** teaches the plasma exposing step after depositing the dielectric film (Paper No. 29, filed 12 September 2002 at p. 19). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Rather, Examiner has applied **Morita** for such teaching and the benefits of such teaching, which would have provided suggestion to one of ordinary skill to apply such teaching to **Yau**. Examiner believes this to have been made clear in the rejection, as above.

Applicant further argues that **Yau** does not use a "dry oxygen" gas to form the dielectric layer (Paper No. 29, filed 12 September 2002 at pp. 19-21). As noted above in the rejection (both the present and the previous, filed 4 June 2002), **Yau** indicates at col. 5, lines 35-37 that O<sub>2</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>O to form the initial dielectric layer prior to the plasma treatment. Simply because hydrogen peroxide is used in exemplary embodiments does not contradict the explicit use of O<sub>2</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>O to form the initial dielectric layer.

Applicant continues to argue in this regard that (CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>x</sub>SiO<sub>y</sub> is not formed in **Yau**. Examiner respectfully disagrees. **Yau** is using, *inter alia*, methyl silane, the same compound used by Applicant. Additionally, **Yau** is using PECVD and the same oxygen-containing gases as in the instant invention, as col. 5 of **Yau** explicitly states. Accordingly, it would appear inherent that **Yau** forms the same material --(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>x</sub>SiO<sub>y</sub>-- since the same method is being used to initially deposit the dielectric film.

Applicant indicates that **Morita** is silent to dielectric constants. However, it is well known that air has a lower dielectric constant than carbon-containing silicon oxide dielectric

material. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill knows very well that removal of carbon with the replacement by vacuum or air necessarily reduces the dielectric constant of a silicon-oxygen-carbon dielectric material. As noted above in the rejection, Applicant admits this in the instant specification.

Regarding the combination of **Morita** with **Yau**, in response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine is as provided in the rejection above, or to further reduce the dielectric constant which is highly desired in the art for reducing RC delay.

Regarding the combination of **Miyasaka** with **Yau** in view of **Morita**, in response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine is as provided in the rejection above: in order to beneficially prevent contamination to the semiconductor device dielectric layer between process steps, as is well known in the art to

Art Unit: 2813

do, and furthermore, because it would simplify the process dramatically by preventing a switch in chambers, as shown in **Miyasaka**.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning in combining **Miyasaka** with **Yau** and **Morita**, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

#### *Conclusion*


Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Erik Kielin whose telephone number is (703) 306-5980 and e-mail address is erik.kielin@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached by telephone on Monday through Thursday 9:00 AM until 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr., can be reached at (703) 308-4940 or by e-mail at carl.whitehead@uspto.gov. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.



EK

October 18, 2002

  
CARL WHITEHEAD, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800